

Attorney's Docket No. 10015158-1Application No. 10/084,459

Page 4

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the subject application are respectfully requested in light of the amendments above and the comments which follow. Claims 1-8 and 14 are pending.

EXAMINER INTERVIEW

Applicant appreciates the opportunity extended by the Examiner to discuss this application. A telephone interview was held on November 5, 2004. In that interview, the *Kleinhenn* reference was discussed. The following remarks are consistent with the telephone conversation. It is respectfully requested that based on the telephone interview and the enclosed remarks, that the application be reconsidered and the present rejections be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS BASED ON KLEINHENN

Kleinhenn discloses a conveyor 22 with pushers 26. The conveyor provides a position 24 for sheets of material to be received on the conveyor from rotating sheet material handling assembly 44. In FIG. 1, the block arrow pointing to the right of the figure indicates the lateral movement of the conveyor 22 and the block arrow pointing to the top of the figure indicates the clockwise rotation of rotating sheet material handling assembly 44 (see also FIG. 5 for clarification of the rotation of rotating sheet material handling assembly 44).

As discussed in the telephone interview, *Kleinhenn* does not disclose all features of the presently rejected independent claims, e.g., claims 1 and 14.

For example, claim 1 recites "a rotatable clamping device including a linearly displaceable clamping component." The examiner has identified pushers 26 on rotating conveyor 22 as corresponding to this feature. However, the pushers are fixed to the conveyor to push sheet material from station to station and the conveyor is not rotating, but rather is displaced laterally as indicated by the block arrow in FIG. 1. There is no rotation of the clamping device in *Kleinhenn*. The only rotation is associated with rotating sheet material handling assembly 44. However, this assembly does not contact the conveyor 22, but rather delivers sheet material to the conveyor 22. Based on this difference, withdrawal of the anticipatory rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

With regard to claim 14, the claim recites at least the following two features not present in *Kleinhenn*.

First, claim 14 recites that the rotatable clamping device delivers folded sheet material to the collecting device. Again, the feature identified by the Examiner as corresponding to the rotatable clamping device is pusher 26 on conveyor 22. However, this feature of *Kleinhenn* does not rotate, but rather translates as indicated by block arrow pointing to the right in FIG. 1. Further, pusher 26 on conveyor 22 in *Kleinhenn* does not deliver folded sheet material to the collecting device. Rather, it is rotating sheet material handling assembly 44 that delivers the material to position 24 for sheets of material to be received.

Second, claim 14 recites a "rotatable clamping device including a linearly displaceable clamping component and a fixed clamping component, wherein the displaceable and fixed clamping components press different portions of the folded sheet material against opposing sides of the collecting device simultaneously."

Attorney's Docket No. 10015158-1Application No. 10/084,459

Page 6

However, the pusher 26 on conveyor 22 (identified by the Examiner as corresponding to the rotatable clamping device) does not press different portions of the folded sheet material against opposing sides of the collecting device simultaneously as presently claimed. Rather, pusher 26 on conveyor 22 merely contacts edges of the sheet material and transports the sheets laterally to a next station by movement of conveyor 22. No pressing of different portions of the folded sheet material against opposing sides of the collecting device simultaneously is associated with pusher 26 on conveyor 22.

Based on these differences, withdrawal of the anticipatory rejection of claim 14 is respectfully requested.

The remaining claims depend from either claim 1 or 14. An anticipatory rejection of these claims should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as noted above.

CLAIM REJECTIONS BASED ON KLEINHEN AND FERAG

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kleinhen* on the grounds set forth on page 3 of the Official Action. This rejection relies upon the pusher 26 of *Kleinhen* being correlated to the displaceable clamping component and should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as outlined above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kleinhen* in view of EP 399 317 to Ferag (hereafter "*Ferag*") on the grounds set forth on page 3 of the Official Action. The relied upon portions of the disclosure in *Ferag* do not overcome the differences noted above with respect to *Kleinhen*. Thus, the

Attorney's Docket No. 10015158-1
Application No. 10/084,459
Page 7

rejection should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as noted above. In addition, the comments regarding *Ferag* and the combination of *Kleinhenn* and *Ferag* submitted in the prior response are incorporated by reference herein.

CONCLUSION

Further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner feel that any issues remain, it is requested that the undersigned be contacted so that any such issues may be adequately addressed and prosecution of the instant application expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: November 5, 2004

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

(703) 836-6620

By: 

Patrick L. Kearne
Registration No. 32,858

Reg No 50,921